UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Art, and the Turmoil of Existence

By FRANCIS NEILSON

A Problem

By JESSE H. HOLMES

A Letter from Russia

By ALINA HUEBSCH

VOLUME LXXXIX NUMBER 2

Chicago, March 9, 1922

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES *: Editors :* FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
HENRY R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
CANADA—Sidney Snow
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss) _____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 19
Art, and the Turmoil of Existence.—FRANCIS NEILSON 21
A Problem.—JESSE H. HOLMES 24

ARTICLES—

Ten Commandments for Citizens—Freeman's Oath, 1634—The Oath of the Athenian Youth 19
A Workingman's View.—FREDERICK C. SAWIN.. 25
A Letter from Russia.—ALINA HUEBSCH..... 27

CORRESPONDENCE—

An Answer to Mr. Dole.—FREDERICK LYNCH.. 28
The Internationalism of Lincoln.—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH 30
The Boycott.—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY..... 30

POETRY—

Petition.—HARRIET LAKE-BURCH 30

THE FIELD—

Neutral Commission of Investigation Into the Causes, Conduct and Conclusion of the War. —*Temple Scott* 31

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

Vol. LXXXIX. THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1922 Number 2

TEN COMMANDMENTS FOR CITIZENS.

1. Thou shalt love thy country which has redeemed thee from tyranny and bondage.
2. Thou shalt not worship any political idols, nor bow down to them, nor serve them for their iniquity will be visited upon thy children unto the third and fourth generation.
3. Thou shalt not take the name of patriotism in vain nor use it as a cloak to hide thy selfish motives.
4. Remember the day of election to keep it holy.
5. Honor the sanctity of the ballot that the days of the republic may be prolonged.
6. Thou shalt not kill the spirit of freedom by neglecting to exercise thy prerogative as a freeman.
7. Thou shalt not adulterate the purity of civic life by entering politics for gain.
8. Thou shalt not encourage public servants to steal by thy indifference.
9. Thou shalt not let greed for political rewards bear false witness against thy patriotism.
10. Thou shalt not covet a public office which thou art not fit to fill.

—*Rabbi Eichler.*

FREEMAN'S OATH, 1634.

I do solemnly bind myself that I will give my vote and suffrance as I shall judge in my own conscience may best conduce to the public weal, so help me God.

THE OATH OF THE ATHENIAN YOUTH.

We will never bring disgrace to this, our city, by any act of dishonesty or cowardice, nor ever desert our suffering comrades in the ranks. We will fight for the ideals and sacred things of the city alone and with many; we will revere and obey the city's laws and do our best to incite a like respect and reverence in those above us who are prone to annul them or set them at naught; we will strive unceasingly to quicken the public's sense of civic duty; thus in all these ways we will transmit this city not only not less but greater, better and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us.

The editor of the London *Nation* (January 14) wonders if Lloyd-George is going to be able "to get away with it." The situation is indeed a piquant one, to say the least. Here is a man who did all he could at the Conference of Versailles to wreck the world, and who, from the day of the Conference even until now, has defended without reservation of any kind, and in the name of justice and the right, the perfection of his handiwork. Now that the wreckage wrought by his ignorance, stupidity and lust is wellnigh complete, he enters upon vast schemes for "the salvaging of civilization." Says the editor of the *Nation* (page 578),

> The Prime Minister is making a large and imaginative effort to undo the disaster which he helped to bring on Europe at Versailles. It needs some self-control to refrain from pointing out that it was he and his allies and his colleagues who made the wreck which he now aspires to salve.

Whether even so resourceful a man as Lloyd-George can accomplish this belated effort at reconstruction, remains still to be proved. Certainly those of us who have seen fulfilled all our dire prophecies of the so-called "Peace," can wish for the English Premier nothing but success in the task of his own undoing. The more thorough-going his present program, the more complete the indictment of his work as peace-maker in 1918-1919. "The present effort," says the editor of the *Nation,* "(seems) entirely sincere." We hope so! It is a time for sincerity; and, for Lloyd-George, a time for repentance and good works. He has much to do if he is to be remembered as other than a "wrecker" of the hopes and dreams of men.

Not the least delightful part of Hendrik Van Loon's "Story of Mankind" (if you haven't read it, *do it now!*), is the quaint array of pictures with which the text is studded. They could not be much cruder, and be pictures at all; but perhaps for this very season do they have a point and thrust to them that are amazing. They remind us in idea, if not in artistic achievement, of Ding's cartoons in the daily press. An exceptionally good example of what Van Loon can do for current events as well as ancient lore is contained in a recent issue of the *Survey.* Under a series of amusing pictures representing hand-to-hand combats in various periods of history, runs the following text:

> The Neanderthaler who fought with a stick called the Cro-Magnard an enemy of society because he fought with a stone axe. The Greek (with his spear) objected to the Persian who fought with a bow and arrow and called him an enemy of

society. The bowman called the cross-bowman an e. of s. The cross-bowman called the harquebusier an e. of s. The man in the battleship called the man in the submarine an e. of s., and so on *ad infinitum*. WHY NOT STOP IT ALTOGETHER?

The case for the abolition of war was never better stated. The hollow farce of limiting armaments while war itself is countenanced, was never shown up more convincingly. As long as we have war, we shall have men using every weapon that money can buy, forges manufacture, and diabolical ingenuity devise. From this point of view, the late Washington Conference was a "joke." Pity to the man, or nation, that cannot see it!

The multiplication of tragic examples of those "American misgivings," which Mrs. Cannon outlines in a recent issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*, is astonishing and humiliating. She seems to indicate, with reservations to be sure, the need of greater intelligence as a means of maintaining and strengthening the future of democracy. As the "Gentleman with the Duster" insists, in "The Glass of Fashion," that goodness is not enough, so we should claim the same inadequacy for intelligence. Five hundred members of the Rotary Club of New York City were thrown into a panic the other day, when a sharp-featured young man, wearing a soft gray shirt and red necktie, jumped upon the platform and engaged in a fervid eulogy of Soviet Russia. At the height of pandemonium, he threw off his disguise and delivered an impassioned Americanization speech that was greeted with as much applause as his previous speech had been condemned. If you had asked these professional apostles of prosperity based on the smile, whether they were intelligent men, they would undoubtedly have admitted that they were. It is not inconceivable, however, that Mr. Everett D. Martin, in some subsequent revision of his "Behavior of Crowds," may reveal their particular variety of inferiority complex. Mrs. Cannon puts her finger on one crying weakness when she says that "We must teach our children to look for the qualities that characterize the able, and to reject the cheap attractions of the demagogue." Intelligence will become our guide when it is realized that intelligence is not enough.

A more striking symbol of the doubts concerning the future of Democracy, which James Bryce indicated, would be difficult to discover than in the public notices of his death and interment as compared with those accorded the late Benedict XV. For many days, details attending the burial of the former Pope filled columns and pages of the daily press, for the very good reason of its obvious news value. Not so with the services for Lord Bryce. While flashy headlines accompanied the Holy Father to his last resting place, just fourteen lines were required to tell the world that services for Viscount Bryce, former British ambassador, were held in the chapel of the Crematorium of Golders Green, and that the choir sang "Lead Kindly Light," and "O God, Our Help in Ages Past." Is there any way of dramatizing democracy? Would it help any if there were? In any case, democracy, with all the weakness of its hold on the masses, is a lot better off than the antiquated machinery of the Vatican. They elected an old man Pope. They always do that. In a few years he also will be gathered to his fathers, and the spectacle of a dying religious autocracy will be rehearsed again.

The waters of educational theory have recently been profoundly stirred by the wide spread discussion and application of the so-called project method in teaching. Stated rather abstractly, the purpose of this method is the development of the reasoning faculties as against a mere memorizing; emphasis upon what a child does as opposed to what he knows; the prosecution of his task in a natural rather than in an artificial setting; and the priority of the problem as opposed to the priority of principles. Generally speaking, the present significance of the project method lies not so much in its novelty or uniqueness, as in the breadth and intensity of its application. The laboratory method has long been recognized as an effective agency in driving home the significance of certain situations which, in the mind of a confused pupil, possessed, like Melchizedek of old, neither beginning of days nor end of life. The application of the project method to such subjects in the Elementary or High School curriculum as English, Civics, Hygiene, Geography, Mathematics, etc., is an established fact, while its usefulness in the field of Religious Education is a possibility not to be treated lightly. The opening question of the Westminster Catechism, "What is the chief end of man?" elicited a highly commendable principle from a speculative point of view. But the inductive method is much superior in Religious Education as it is in science. Solve the problem and the principle upon which it is based will eventually disclose itself. "He that willeth to do the will, shall know the doctrine."

This testimony to the merits and limitations of the project method leads us to observe that one of the most astounding and spectacular projects upon which any of the modern sciences appears to have ventured is embodied in the recent formation of the Psychological Corporation in New York. "The objects and powers of this corporation," according to the second article of its charter, "shall be the advancement of psychology and the promotion of the useful application of psychology" to educational, business, administrative, and other problems. This movement is said to be the

first corporation organized under the business laws of any state whose earnings must be devoted to scientific research. To one whose inclinations keep him close to the scorners' bench, it will be easy to lampoon such an enterprise and to crown the science of psychology as the mother of the only corporation endowed with a soul. The utilization of these recent remarkable discoveries of man's mental processes in the fields of industry, politics, and education may become a curse or a blessing according to the motive which lies behind it. We need all the help we can get if the present state of affairs is to be molded closer to the heart's desire. The list of directors includes some of the most distinguished educators in America, headed by Doctor James R. Angell, President of Yale. Particularly is one reassured by the Presidency of the corporation in the person of Professor J. McKeen Cattell, one of the most eminent and sincere students in the entire field of psychology. The so-called army intelligence tests proved of incalculable value in classifying nearly two million officers and men for the department for which they were best adapted. If the Psychological Corporation can carry something of this mental insight over into the wiser organization of democracy, may not our persistent misgivings be somewhat allayed?

William Jennings Bryan declares that the doctrine of evolution is untrue because there is "not one syllable in the Bible to support it." This fact, we must confess, does not disturb us very much, but we would think that it would disturb Mr. Bryan mightily, for this is a decidedly devastating argument which he here presents. Mr. Bryan undoubtedly accepts the Copernican theory of the universe, but we should like to see him produce "one syllable in the Bible to suppport it." Mr. Bryan, we believe, accepts the modern theories of medicine, and when ill places himself in the hands of the most skilful physician that he can find; but we would search the Bible in vain for anything to sustain the remedies and rules which this physician would apply to his case. Mr. Bryan, if we remember rightly, is a Prohibitionist; but we should like to see him give the Scriptural authority for his doctrine. It is a pity, we think, for Mr. Bryan to take up his cudgels against evolution, and at this late date renew the lost fight against it. We have always had a warm spot in our heart for the Nebraska statesman. He is a great orator, a true democrat, an ardent champion of international peace, an amiable, unselfish and incorruptible character; he has long deserved well of his countrymen, and will be honorably remembered in American history. For him now to enter a field of discussion where he knows nothing, and busy himself in propagating the superstition and ignorance of a long-dead generation, is little short of a tragedy. Has Mr. Bryan no faithful and educated friend who will acquaint him with a few facts, and turn him aside from the pathway of folly upon which he now is entering?

We rejoice to see *The Christian Register* denouncing and ridiculing the statistics of church membership recently published by the Federal Council on the basis of census figures, and are only sorry that the protest was not sounded until the Unitarian "ox was gored." The statement that the Unitarians had lost 30,880 members as compared with the 1916 figures, is of course ridiculous; but it is no more ridiculous than the statements accrediting various orthodox churches with increases in membership of tens and hundreds of thousands, running up in the end to totals of over a million! The whole picture of swelling church lists and overcrowded church congregations is so preposterously absurd, as compared with what every observer knows to be the actual facts in the case, that one knows not whether to yield to indignation or give way to paroxysms of mirth. As we like to get a laugh whenever we can, we incline toward the latter alternative. This business of church statistics, as the *Register* well says, is a "big joke," not to be regarded "as a respectable matter." "If a real church-supporting person were the norm, the number in good standing in all the churches in this country would be not more than one-half the solemn returns of the Government Census." Even this we think to be a gross exaggeration; we would put it at not more than one-fourth at the very utmost! The overwhelming majority of all registered church members are not "among those present" at all, but among the "lost, strayed, or stolen."

Art, and the Turmoil of Existence

Those who predicted something great in art would come from the war are now strangely silent; they are like the political and ecclesiastical ministers who promised some enduring good to come from all the evil, a promise which was in the nature of a sop thrown to their own disturbed consciences. Neither the great art work nor the social good has been produced. Some seven years are gone leaving no trace of a renaissance in literature or in art or in ethics. It may be said that the time has been too short for the artist to take up the task and produce a great work. That may be, but there is no art tendency to be noticed anywhere of so promising a nature that the curious traveller in the fields of creative effort can feel that patience is all that is required.

The best produced in literature and art since the

war began has no higher value than that of a decade ago. It is only necessary to look through the galleries of London, Paris, and Berlin to be assured of this with regard to painting. It would be idle to mention the literary products of our day for the purpose of comparing them with those of the period following the French Revolution. There is nothing much to be gained by such a discussion; besides the people of our time seem to have a notion of constructive criticism which is all their own. It must, however, be recognized that many of our authors and artists are technically proficient in a high degree, but technique is not everything; it is the means employed, not the material used in producing a great work. Whether our artists feel as deeply as those of the past is quite another matter. And it is in this element, which the masters of the older schools enjoyed in abundance, that we find ours sadly lacking. For this defect, however, they are not to be blamed; not hastily, at any rate, for the time has been out of joint, the age a most unfortunate one for the creative spirit. Now, great art cannot be produced unless deep feeling is present at the moment when the subject is selected. The springs of emotion must be ready to gush, the music must be ready to surge up when the invisible fingers of nature strike a chord in the artist's soul. He must be sensitive, finely tuned, responsive to the natural joys and sorrows of the universe, and always keenly alive to the passion and the beauty which are in life itself. The atmosphere for all these essentials has been lacking, there has been little or no chance now for the artist to live and move and have his being under conditions which would stimulate creative effort. We might then, if we realize the sad deficiencies of our day with regard to suitable locale for the artist, ask ourselves whether the time is ripe for creative effort. Suppose some genius were to come from the wilderness and present a masterpiece to us, would we recognize it as a great work? Are we capable of judging a great work? What qualifications have we for estimating the worth of a creation of a genius? None at all. Surely that is evident when we consider the condition into which criticism has fallen. But if this be not sufficient to judge us, what shall be said of our capacity to criticize in a constructive sense when the enthusiasms of our youth run in the direction of anything that is new? New art, new music, new literature, new forms of any kind so long as they are new! Away with the old models! To limbo with the classical! Anything will be accepted by the young so long as it reminds them of nothing in the past. Surely the time is not ripe for the artist, nor are we ready for a great creative effort to be presented to us. How can it be otherwise? For half a century at least before the war began, our minds were fixed upon material goals in what the sociologist calls the struggle for existence. The legislative acts of any government of the great western civilizations reflect in great measure the conditions under which we have lived. The statute books of all countries, with few exceptions, have been filled with measures for dealing with industrial conditions, poverty, disease, housing, unemployment, and so on. The stress and the turmoil of existence has never been absent from our minds. Then came the war to crown the misery and the woe that parliaments for nearly one hundred years in Europe strove to palliate. We have had no time to saturate ourselves in any one great deep well of feeling for a noble literature or fine art. The distresses of our time have entered our being and warped our judgments. They have reduced us to a sentimentality that is as baneful to a critical attitude in art and literature as it is in the realm of economics and politics; a sentimentality which has been quite foreign to deep feeling: a sentimentality that has been superficial, gushy, projected by no fine instinct.

If the artist has been in the midst of all this during the past eight years he has been living in a world of noise, vulgarity and perplexity. All the strife of the time must have flung itself pell-mell upon his nerve centers. Has there been one noble incident that has had a chance in all the travail to win his co-operation? Spiritually there has been nothing for him to do but endure an incessant round of shocks, shocks that must have hurt his soul. The best thing he has in all probability done is to save himself by withdrawing within himself, shuddering perhaps like a frightened child among the baneful shadows of the night. What has there been in all the tragedy and sorrow of famine and destruction to make his soul expand and glow with warmth? War monopolized the thought of every section of society; its business turned into every channel of life, and would not be restrained. What time was there for a great creative effort? How could the sensitive artist respond to the general prejudice, the hysterical appeals, the glaring untruths of political and diplomatic hucksters whose main task was that of giving the people no time to discover their own war criminals? What had the true artist to do with all that disreputable business? Who has seen the painted portraits of the heroes of the affair and not shuddered at the lineaments of craft, greed and megalomania that dominate the features of these men? And now in this period of remorse in which the whole system of political perdition is laid bare, when the cant and the bunkum which always attended the disasters reek in the post-war literature of the protagonists, how can the artist, if he attempts to read these books for the purpose of learning what the war was about, set to work to give us a great creative effort? He must realize that he is living in a world of madmen, impervious to any appeal that he might make. If he look timidly from the window which he kept curtained while the fray was at its height, what beauty can he see? He looks and suddenly realizes that the atmosphere

outside is noisome, and he withdraws again from a world riven by revolution, starvation and disease. There is a precedent for this attitude of the true artist which is worth recording. When Goethe was reproached for not assisting the German War of Liberation, either as a soldier or a poet, his reply was:

> "How could I write songs of hatred without hate! And between ourselves, I did not hate the French, although I thanked God that we were free from them. How could I, to whom culture and barbarism are alone of importance, hate a nation which is among the most cultivated of the earth, and to which I owe so great a part of my own culture? Altogether, national hatred is something peculiar. You will always find it strongest and most violent where there is the lowest degree of culture. But there is a degree where it vanishes altogether, and where one stands to a certain extent *above* nations, and feels the weal and woe of a neighboring people, as if it had happened to one's own. This degree of culture was conformable to my nature, and I had become strengthened in it long before I had reached my sixtieth year."

This is directly to the point. It is impossible for the artist to take part in a struggle for national political supremacy in which the highest duty of patriotism is considered to be reached when the worst features of the enemy's character are preferred to his best. The artist is lost when he is thrust into the company of ignorant people who are given authority to lead the mob, to coerce the thoughtful, and to traduce all that is best in the culture of a foe. If personality in art is of any moment at all, surely it must suffer grave injury the moment it is labeled, given a number, thrust into the routine of a hard disciplinary existence. For personality must assert itself in its own way, and direct the inclinations and purposes of the artist if life is to be understood and any real happiness is to be derived from it. In such a turmoil as this through which we have passed self-assertion was impossible. War struck an almost mortal blow at personality.

It may be that we have reached a stage in our history when creative artists no longer require the conditions for production that were so necessary to the great figures of the past. It may be that the war put the finishing touch to a vast scheme of complete social change, a scheme which in some strange way evolved from the industrial and economic conditions which revealed themselves so forcibly in the last half of the nineteenth century. For all we know we may be entering upon another renaissance; one of factory chimneys, grime, smoke, slums, and that harmony and beauty as they were understood will have no place in the new era. It may be necessary in such a scheme of things to invent a new art language. If this should be the state of affairs, then it is not easy to imagine what place such an essay as Goethe's "Upon the Laocoon" will hold in the new art world.

After seeing so much of the new art, hearing so much of the new music, reading so many of the new novels, it seems quite old-fashioned to refer to an essay written over a hundred and twenty years ago by an all-round master, certainly the world's greatest critic. The ideas expressed in it seem to have no place in this world in which we live. The knowledge and the inspiration in it seem to be as far removed from our day as the eighteenth century was from the period when the artists produced the sculpture Goethe loved.

Perhaps it is the conditions of our life that are chiefly responsible for the startling changes that are taking place in art. There is no soul in the existence of our world, and without a soul the people cannot aspire, and where there is no aspiration in the life of the people, art, as we know it, must perish. This is the day of the town, and there are millions in every community that consider themselves well blessed when they can cut adrift from the country. It is said that the majority of the young people born in rural districts abhor the thought of passing their lives there. What hope is there for art when the tendency of the mass of the people is to become town dwellers? He must be an exceptional person who can live in a town and shut himself in from all its noise and artificiality, who can withdraw from the great mass of ugliness and insincerity that are noticed in most of its activities. There was a time when the artist was particular about the locale in which he worked. Solitude was absolutely necessary to him, and there was a time when solitude was near at hand, a refuge easily gained. It is not so simple now to find the suitable locale for the contemplative mood. Civilization in town and country has been so completely commercialized that it is now brought to the door with the morning's milk; and there is no beating a successful retreat from its blatant vulgarity and din when the daily papers appear. But it surely must be necessary yet for the true artist to escape all these modern accessories of existence if he would give us of his best. Life, of course, is here; it is everywhere; but it is life in turmoil, and its poverty of soul is evident always. The turmoil of it, and the soullessness of it are the art destroying features of the day. What hope is there for the artist arresting the mad torrent of life as it rushes past him so that he may have it in pause, take the time to contemplate its real significance, to plumb its depths, to recreate it and give us a work of harmony and love? Without contemplation artistic analysis is scarcely possible, that analysis which is so essential if the artist is to epitomize life so that he can produce from a world of his own the passion and the beauty which add to the sum of human joy.

FRANCIS NEILSON.

A Problem

A prominent "evangelist" is quoted in the daily papers as saying,

> Preachers do too much arguing and explaining these days. The Bible doesn't do that: it proclaims! Preachers should proclaim God from their pulpits, and demand the allegiance of the people. Proclaim God and his laws, and stop speculating and arguing about it.

This statement involves one of two alternative assumptions: (1) All preachers are either authorities whose statements should be accepted without question, or speak for such authorities. (2) They should limit their preaching to statements already accepted by their hearers "in principle," their function being to induce men to act in harmony with their own ideals. There is so much foggy thinking abroad,—so much religious inertia in and outside the churches—that it is most necessary to face squarely this question of authority.

(1) The Roman Catholic Church has a theory and a system consistent with itself and forming a closed circuit. It has an answer to every possible question which should satisfy those who accept its premises. It claims to have, in the papacy, an institution from which authoritative and final answers may be obtained to any and every human query. Those who accept it understand that they solve problems of life as the child solves problems in school: it is done to exercise and stimulate the mind, not for the discovery of the truth; for the truth is known already and if conclusions do not agree with the dictum of authority they must be changed. For the Roman Catholic Church the statement of the evangelist applies literally.

The Protestant preacher is in a wholly different position. He can hardly claim infallibility for himself or for any living representative of his faith. He therefore falls back on an infallible Bible. If the writer deal seriously with this preposterous claim for the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures it is because the claim is so widely made and so widely accepted. Even those who question it are likely to be apologetic and respectful in their questioning. Yet a very little consideration will make it plain to any fair minded person that such words as "infallible" and "inerrant" when applied to a book have no meaning at all. It is not so much that such a claim for the Bible or any other book is a mistaken one, as that it is an impossibile one. Any one who asserts it is in fact claiming infallibility not for the book but for himself. A book does not and cannot contain ideas. It is a material object made of paper and printer's ink. It contains symbols arbitrarily agreed upon as having certain—or rather very uncertain—meanings. The claim that any given person can get from those symbols facts or ideals which are inevitably true, is a claim that he is himself infallible. Such a claim for the Protestant ministry is just plain nonsense. We have a very great respect for many Protestant ministers; but very many of them are ill-educated, crude and narrow, just as many of the rest of us are. They contradict themselves and each other as the rest of us do. They are just folks:—very good folks usually, but in no way remarkable in intelligence, veracity, or courage. I have had many of them express in private beliefs and unbeliefs which they stated frankly they would not dare to express in public. I have been told very earnestly and sadly that they often teach what they do not themselves believe. This is not a condemnation of the ministry as a class; it is merely an indication of the fact, which they would not themselves question, that they are human and fallible, both as to ordinary human problems and as to Biblical interpretation as well. To take a familiar example, many of them in every generation (including our own) have set times for the second coming of Christ, which have come and gone without that event. Just now thousands are preaching the millennium as impending, and other thousands are denying it. The fact of some hundred and forty different Protestant sects in America, many of them differing on matters which they regard as essential, is conclusive as to any demand that their pastors or leaders shall be regarded as authorities. Yet the Bible cannot be a final authority unless its interpreter is also a final authority. To assert that it is can only mean a refusal to face the issue. Truth is not symbol but a meaning, and only minds can contain meanings. It must follow if ministers are not infallible that they must "argue and explain" whenever they present statements not generally accepted. They should then—according to the dictum above quoted—limit themselves to exhortations, urging men to live their faith, —which is the second alternative proposed at the opening of this article.

(2) What then may the preacher, thus limited, assume to be generally accepted? I suppose many of them would say that the Apostles' Creed is thus generally accepted. We may stretch a point and admit—just for the sake of the argument—that church members accept the Apostles' Creed, but is it to be supposed that preachers are to talk only to church members? To induce any others to accept this mysterious statement of uncertain meaning from a wholly unknown source would certainly call for "explanation and argument." Futhermore, its acceptance need have no effect whatever on conduct. Anyone, good or bad, might believe it and remain good or bad. A devil might believe it and remain a devil.

There remains only some possible code of conduct

and we assert that Christianity has no code of morals for which it will stand consistently. Under ordinary conditions it will demand the ten commandments in a very abstract way. But so soon as class conflicts arise the decalogue loosens up in various places, and in case of international warfare it dissolves altogether. The Christian "commandment" to love one another is explained away in all difficult cases until it amounts to little more than that we love those who love us, and who belong to our class and nation. It is not difficult to replace it with what is essentially a demand that we hate people.

We recognize that this is a serious charge and it is so intended. It may be summed up in the statement that the Christian church of today is essentially a state church and a class church: that it has no world message; that it stands only for vague and narrow personal respectability and takes no responsibility for the bringing in of the "kingdom on earth." There are many notable and noble exceptions in the individual lives of representatives of Christian churches, and there are a few fine and forward-looking statements from church assemblies; but there is no "church of God" that moves "like a mighty army" in the interest of a genuinely Christian world, and there is no general demand that the lives of members of Christian churches shall be in accord with the things they accept "in principle."

What shall the church proclaim?

JESSE H. HOLMES.

A Workingman's View

The changing social order that is now spreading over the world is a part of the new day that is dawning. This order that is gradually and gently working a beneficent revolution all over the world is the result of a unifying force, and this great force consists of the efforts of all of us who do acts for *service* instead of, or, as is often the case, in connection with, material compensation. All of us do things for service—love—and they are the happiest things we do, even though the accomplishment costs us some of the possessions that society demands for its standard of success. Happily the time is passing when success merely calls for *possession* of power or material wealth without asking what was done for it. Society's unquestioning acceptance of this old standard of success has been the greatest obstacle to human progress. Even now nearly every theory of betterment conforms to that standard, and because it does conform it fails to accomplish that which it intends. However, the results of the struggle of these embryonic movements for reform are invaluable because they draw the fire of the reactionary forces from the forces of love and service that are therefore practically unimpeded, working for the welfare of all humanity in its progress on the highway of the brotherhood of man. These movements are valuable in another way. In their muckraking way they operate in the social fields as the workers do in the truckers' fields working over the compost heaps of fertilizers. From the rich decay of the old industrial institutions that have so utterly failed to alleviate the needs of suffering humanity, and which have been worked over so thoroughly by the muckrakers, is even now, vigorously growing, society's new standard of success that bears the legend of "Service" instead of "possession."

In this dawning of the new day it is very important that we fully realize that we are working under the new standard of service instead of the old standard of possession, as the realization will greatly accelerate progress.

By reading H. G. Wells's "Outline of History," we can go up in an airplane of time, and with this advantage can discern in the beginnings of man the almost unconscious acts of love, which are the germs that develop into lives consecrated to service. In the industrial world, for example, witness the great, good accomplished by Robert Owen (1771-1858), an English cotton spinner. Were it not for his efforts in the founding of co-operation the struggles of the poor Rochdale weavers, which have grown into a great power for good, would have availed nothing. In the realm of religion the acts of service are more abundant than in the realm of industry, as might be expected. However, the forces working under the old standard of "Believe or Be Damned" do not fulfill the demands of humanity. Hence the disintegration of the old institutions which is now occurring! The new standard for religious workers, "Serve and Be Saved," is growing vigorously. The realization that we are working under the new standard is just as important as that given for workers in the realm of industry. The religious and industrial forces are thus mingling and working together harmoniously. Glory be to God! Among the world-wide forces working under the new standard in the religious realm should be mentioned the Bahai movement that originated in Southwestern Asia. Among the world-wide movements working under the new standard in the realm of industry is co-operation, which eliminates private profit, and to which we will give further attention later.

Those acts of love and service in the far beginnings were few and short-lived, but they flash brightly, as the diamond dew drops in the lush grass when the sun shines after a shower in May, and their brightness is enhanced by the dark background of those times. As time progresses, these bright flashes of service and love become more numerous and permanent until now the light is the dawning of a better day. Even the light from those behind the walls of privilege is shining brightly. Those walls are the circle that the clear visioned poet, Edwin Markham, saw when he wrote:

> He drew a circle that shut me out—
> Heretic, rebel—a thing to flout.
> But Love and I had the wit to win;
> We drew a circle that took him in.

The ends sought were not lofty ends in those early times. Individuals gave up some of their individual privileges, and the group to which they belonged was thereby strengthened. As time passed the ends sought became more lofty until now the demand is for nothing less than the Brotherhood of Man, and that means universal brotherhood, without regard to race or sex.

The attainment of brotherhood is not a goal. It is only a milestone on the highway of human progress—the highway that leads ever onward and upward to more perfect ways. Even now dreamers dream of projecting noble sentiments of progress to other worlds and impressing them on the inhabitants thereof; and who is there rash enough to say that some of our own discoveries and inventions and ideas of progress were not impressed on us by inhabitants of other spheres!

H. G. Wells's "Outline of History" is a book that stimulates optimism. One is impressed that the book is written for that purpose, and if so it is a sublime purpose. However, Mr. Wells slighted the opportunity for exploiting what is perhaps the greatest tool for accelerating the progress of man on the highway of universal brotherhood. In volume II, page 406, Mr. Wells dismisses the subject of co-operation with the words, "The co-operative societies of today, societies of poor men which combine for the collective buying and distribution of commodities or for collective manufacture or dairying or other forms of agriculture, arose directly out of his (Robert Owen's) initiatives, though the pioneer co-operative societies of his own time ended in failure. Their successors have spread throughout the whole world, and number today some thirty or forty million of adherents."

To show how much Mr. Wells underestimates the number of adherents to co-operation, the following list of countries and the number of members of co-operative organizations are given, and it should be borne in mind that the members of co-operative organizations are usually heads of families the members of which are also adherents; and, too, the number of those who are not members of co-operative organizations but are adherents thereto in the sense that they believe in the justice and righteousness of co-operation is very large, probably exceeding the number of members:

IX—Great Britain

	No. of co-operative Societies	No. of Members	Number per Society
1862	331	89,000	269
1872	930	324,000	348
1882	1,043	598,000	573
1892	1,420	1,127,000	794
1902	1,476	1,893,000	1,215
1912	1,399	2,750,000	1,970
1914	1,385	3,054,000	2,205

Since 1902 the societies have decreased in number but the number of members has risen by two-thirds.

France

	Number of Societies	Number of Members	Number per Society
1900	939	375,000	400
1907	2,214	705,000	318
1914	3,156	876,000	278

The number of societies has tripled since 1900, but the average membership has decreased one-third. The Anglo-Saxon tendency is to amalgamate and the French tendency is the opposite. France has more small societies with a much smaller overturn, as one-third of them are bakeries and most of the stores sell only groceries.*

Giant Russia alone has thirty million co-operative members, and, counting five to the family as adherents to the movement, the number amounts to nearly four times the maximum number of "adherents" with which Mr. Wells credits the whole world.

"Today the co-operative societies in Great Britain have a membership of four million families; this means over one-third of the total population. For forty years the movement has been growing five times faster than the population has increased." Germany has thirty million adherents to the co-operative movement. France five million; Belgium nearly two million. In Holland, Switzerland, Czecho-Slovakia, Japan, India, all over the world, the movement is growing by leaps and bounds. On account of the extent of freedom in the United States, the movement was not strong until we lost a large measure of our liberty. Now there are over a half million members of co-operative societies and many times that number of adherents.

To throw some light on the magnitude of the co-operative movement in Great Britain and also to show the great love for serving the people co-operators entertain we further quote from the "Story of Co-operation," by Agnes D. Warbasse, as follows.

It is interesting to note in Great Britain that while co-operative labor gets slightly higher wages than are paid in the same trade in private business, yet its managers and leaders have salaries that would be scorned by captains of industry in competitive organizations of similar character. The Movement is training thousands of highly efficient executives. Some go into capitalistic employment; most of them remain loyal to the Movement. One, upon being offered a position with higher pay in private business, said: "My fellow co-operators pay me sufficient to satisfy my needs. I am happy *serving the people.* I should not be happy serving you at the expense of the people." He is no exception. Amongst many others such as he, is William Maxwell, president of the Scottish Wholesale, a federation of two hundred and sixty-six consumers' societies. At a yearly salary of 350 pounds he organized thirty-seven factories in twenty-seven years. In 1919 the Scottish Wholesale manufactured over six million pounds' worth of goods, it did a business of twenty-seven million pounds, and carried an insurance fund of one million, two hundred thousand pounds. The sales of the first half of 1920 showed an increase of 27 per cent. President Thorpe of the British Co-operative Wholesale at present receives 850 pounds yearly. He has thirty thousand workers under his direction, in sixty-eight factories, mills and warehouses. The directors of the Wholesale receive a yearly salary of only five hundred pounds. This wholesale society in 1920 did a business of one hundred million pounds, an increase of 23 per cent.

The world is sore, or, rather, humanity is suffering the world over. There is plenty of what humanity needs stored in warehouses,—goods that cannot be sold because the people have not the money to buy them—therefore the great problem of production is solved and the comparatively simple problem of distribution takes its place. So the condition of society, the conditions humanity is suffering from, are artificial and can be remedied.

Because of quick means of communication and transportation the nations of the world today are closer to each other than the states that the United States is composed of were at the time they were federated; therefore the nations of the world may be federated and then war between them will be just as unthinkable as war between our states, and this federation will come in time; but there must be an immediate remedy that bears various qualifications, chief among which are:

1. It must be world wide.
2. It must be available to any country in the world without having special laws passed to make it applicable.
3. It must arouse no effectual resistance.

Co-operation has these qualifications. It is already world wide. Co-operative organizations exist in all countries, and there is an international organization of co-operatives.

It is universally available under present conditions. No special laws have to be passed to make it operative.

*See Emerson P. Harris, "Co-operation the Hope of the Consumer." The Macmillan Co., 1918. p. 238.

It can arouse no effectual resistance, for it operates by the same methods as those who would resist it. To attempt to resist it is to further disintegrate and "muckrake" the putrefaction of the old institutions.

Co-operation is very healthy and is growing by leaps and bounds all over the world. It was invented and instituted by twenty-eight poor weavers who had just emerged from an unsuccessful strike in Rochdale, England, in 1843. At that time they started with nothing. At the present time they are doing a business of over three million dollars a day in *Great Britain alone!* They own ships and charter others. They own and till land in various countries of the world. They produce many articles that they sell in their own stores. . . . But one cannot tell all about co-operation in a limited article like this. There is an abundance of good literature on the subject. Among the latest and best the writer knows of is Emerson P. Harris's book, "Co-operation the Hope of the Consumer." Macmillan Co., 1918; also, Agnes D. Warbasse's 10-cent pamphlet, "The Story of Co-operation," published by the Co-operative League of America, 2 West 13th Street, New York, 1921, both quoted above. The history of co-operation reads like a romance. It is a great light that makes clear the highway over which is moving the brotherhood of man. Its importance in accelerating the movement cannot be overestimated. The whole movement is actuated by service. The element of private profit is eliminated. Every one is cared for. Who would not rather leave a legacy of justice and righteousness to his dependents—a substantial legacy—than an uncertain fortune, swollen though it be?

In the field of religion, the Bahai movement is comparable to the co-operative movement in the industrio-economic field. Albert Vail, 5478 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, says of the Bahai Movement in a pamphlet—

> Apparently it is not so much an organization as a spiritual attitude, not so much a new religion as religion renewed. Its followers are found in all sorts of ecclesiastical organizations. To be a Bahai a man need not sever his previous religous affiliations; he may remain a Buddhist, or Hindoo Brahman, a Parsee, a Mohammedan, or a Christian. He becomes one of the Bahai Movement when he catches the Bahai spirit.

The religious standard has been "Believe or Be Damned." Muckraking is doing the same work in the religious field that it is doing in the industrio-economic field, and the vigorously growing standard bears the sublime words SERVE AND BE SAVED.

Under the common standard of Service the industrio-economic, religious, science and art movements are mingling in one irresistible stream.

The world is a better place to live in because our forefathers lived and labored before us, and we are making it better for those who come after us.

FREDERICK C. SAWIN.

A Letter from Russia

[NOTE—The following letter has just been received from our correspondent in Russia, Mrs. Alina Huebsch. Her statement of conditions in Russia is one which should wring the hearts of all of our readers. We print the letter here not merely for the information that it conveys, but also in the hope that it may bring us contributions for the support of the work which she is doing under such agonizing conditions. All who care to contribute may send checks or money orders direct to Mr. Holmes at 61 East 34th Street, New York City.—EDITORS.]

". . . I do sincerely hope that there will be no delay with help from good people all over the world. The winter is here, the need is greater than ever before; besides food, everyone needs warm clothing and felt boots, or at least leather shoes, as canvas slippers and 'natural-skin' stockings are intolerable now, although there are clever fingers which make stockings out of used gingham dresses and substitute shoes out of pieces of old carpets. The food situation and the joint transportation problem are serious. The absence of fats makes everyone more susceptible to cold weather. From the Volga district an official writes in a paper that only one out of four can be fed—the rest must starve—millions of children, nursing and pregnant women among them. And this happy fourth one is fed only with the A. R. A. help! The Spring may bring disaster. The typhus is watching half-naked, half-starved, unwashed people. Soap is so rare, so valuable, that only some of the people may afford to buy it. The typhus ravages especially among the unfortunates who come here from Volga's hungry shores. Many hospitals are closed as there is not enough soap or medicine or general supplies. Lice are ever present and I soon acquired the habit of using a fine comb after each trip in a car, etc. But there are thousands who cannot afford the luxury of a fine comb!

"Do not imagine, please, that there are starving people only in the Volga region. Right here in Petrograd there are tubercular, blood-spitting patients who have no way to satisfy their hunger. There are mothers who nurse babies, being hungry themselves. There are students who are fainting from hunger during their examinations. Some days ago I met a plain working man who visited this fall the Volga region. 'Why did you not come to see me for such a long time,' I asked. 'I was mentally afflicted,' quietly answered he. 'What do you mean?' I said. 'My mind was sick,' repeated he calmly. 'Why,' said I, 'did you see something terrible there?' 'More than that,' gravely reported the man. 'I saw crowds and crowds of starving population, all ragged, bare, dying, crawling on the shores around each harbor, clinging to each boat, hoping that it will take them away from that horrid death. I cannot forget them since that time.' We both became silent. I was thinking about a young woman physician who similarly became insane after being engaged in the work among sick and starving children. I was thinking also about those angels in human form that the German Red Cross sent here. Those heroic physicians and nurses are working in the darkest snowbound villages along Volga's shores.

"I try to raise my feeble voice and ask you in the name of numberless souls who now are losing hope—give us your brotherly help! Think about our babies who at the age of four look as though they were two; imagine bluish pale faces, skinny arms, large swollen bellies. Lately I visited again an institution for young children near Petrograd. I was appalled once more—there was almost perfect silence in a crowd of some thirty children of the age of two, three and four years. No playing, no noise, no laughing, no talking. I would say that there was almost uni-

versal inactivity, apathy. Hungry children cannot be talkative or playful. Besides there is not a toy, not a doll, not a ball in the house—what shall the kiddies do?

"In spite of all, however, the new life is manifesting itself here and there. The free, popular, creative schools were born during the hard years. The House of Fine Arts, The House of Science, The School of the Living Word, the Grand Opera, and dozens of different theatres open their doors regularly. A new theatre, 'The Youthful Spectator,' is announced to be opened soon, especially for young people. The philosophic discussions, literary evenings, concerts and lectures on various topics are everyday events. Ten new publishing houses sprang up this winter.

"Recently I witnessed an extraordinary exhibit arranged as a crowning achievement of the new working schools. If one takes into consideration all the hardships, lack of books, paper, pencils, ink, maps, the lack of food, fuel, clothing, shoes, all the essentials for maintaining health and even life itself, one must be only amazed before this accomplished wonder. Only an effort which is more than human could accomplish this. To see neatly finished plans, diagrams, a multitude of pictures in good taste, orderly collections of plants and minerals, cleverly built models of tools, machinery, etc.—all created from nearly nothing. It was like witnessing a miracle. There were also a few dozen of artistically done pieces of work performed by several youthful sculptors, most probably with half-frozen and swollen fingers. Imagine a young artist, skinny, with red and inflamed eyes, as the 'petchurki' (little movable iron stoves now in fashion on account of the lack of fuel) often smoke frightfully, in the dim light of a 'fitulka' (a kerosene home-made lamp, generally a little glass jar with a tin cover in which through a tiny hole a narrow rag is inserted) working out patiently his inspiration. The artist is ragged, uncombed, shivering from cold and with a constant feeling of emptiness in his stomach. From day to day his mind centers on food.

"I wish I could speak to some civilized people living in the civilized world. Do they really wish that these children and talented young people should perish for the reason that they have no proper food, no proper shoes, no rubbers at all? Perhaps it is hard for you who never were hungry, who never had hard luck, to know how from day to day the body melts away, how the face becomes a bony little mask, to understand the real meaning of the short word—hunger.

"But in spite of all, *all*, the noble human spirit is still alive. I remember how I came to a family meal of a noted professor and principal of a college. I saw some dry black bread, some watery soup with beans in it, baked potatoes, and tea with saccharin. This was a full dinner. The wife, also a professor and artist, sweetening the tea with her saccharin for their frail looking girl of four, explained, 'We are often unable to secure sugar and milk for our little girlie.' 'Now you know how we are living,' said the master of the house. An hour later the very same professor was opening a passionate discussion on behalf of a new form of the Russian theatre, which very likely will soon replace our old-fashioned theatre. To my mind also comes the picture of a poet, skinny and yellow from chronic hunger, with bare toes seen through his transparent boots.

"I am myself seriously sick and am soon going to be operated on. I know that I may die because there is not enough soap in the hospital for the nurse to wash her hands, or because of the lack of clean linen; but even then, with my freezing lips, I will try to whisper, 'Long live the Soviets!' Our sufferings, mine among numberless others, are necessary. The new Renaissance cannot be accomplished without pain. Some five years ago I adopted a baby boy. He is here now with us. In case of my death I wish he could get back to the United States. If you could arrange for him to be somewhere near you, among your church people, under your influence, I would feel happy. His father is a poor workman in Hamburg. His mother is dead. This may be my last letter. I am obliged to ask you once more to arrange to let people know that they must help. This is my last desire. . . If you find this letter interesting, let it be printed in UNITY and please send one number to me. I am in bed and unable to write longer. . .

ALINA HUEBSCH.

CORRESPONDENCE

An Answer to Mr. Dole

2 March, 1922.

To the Editors of UNITY:

As editor of *World Friendship* I have read with great interest the article in UNITY of February sixteenth by my good friend, Mr. Dole, on "What the Mob Mind Does!" in which he holds me up as the terrible example. Inasmuch as I have generally been number among that despised sect called "Pacifists," having been listed with the elect in Mr. Archibald Stevens' "Who's Who in the Pacifist Movement," and am still held in suspicion by all those who dearly love a row, the example is "all the more striking." Perhaps I may have the consolation of the fallen, that my fall from grace may save others and thus win grace by being a fearful warning. Only this week I was denounced to my face for being pro-German so perhaps I may serve as a warning in two directions—a surely enviable role. As a matter of fact my position in the whole matter is so simple that I thought a child could understand it, but I have evidence from day to day that my pacifist friends cannot. Is it not because I am not more than a pacifist? that I am not a non-resistant, a disbeliever in all forms of force or use of force under any conditions whatever?

A pacifist is one who believes in the settlement of international disputes by peaceable methods instead of by war, the method that has hitherto prevailed between nations. He believes that nations can use Courts, methods of arbitration, or councils of conciliation, and conferences as individuals have learned to use them in all civilized communities. For this I have been pleading and working for many years—much of the time in happy co-operation with Mr. Dole himself—and am still working night and day. I know, as everybody else knows, that it is just as easy for nations to live under the community law, "each for all, and all for each," and where wars are unknown, as it is for individuals and just as imperative. For this I am working with both eagerness and faith. I abominate war and disbelieve in it as absolutely as does Mr. Dole or my non-resistant friends. I would not support my

own country in a deliberately waged war with any other nation any more than I would support my neighbor in a duel. War and duel are the same terms—one applied to deliberately waged contests by nations and the other by individuals over a point in dispute. I believe that the Hague Conferences and the recent conference at Washington are steps taken by sincere men in that direction, only the participants do not possess that faith in the community life of nations that I and thousands of others have. But let us welcome any step of governments toward the realization of the community life, even the League of Nations, for it is in that way, and that way only that wars will be abolished, as it was by that way they were abolished between individuals.

It is not my attitude toward war that Mr. Dole criticizes, for my attitude toward wars and duels is the same as his. It is my attitude toward the ruthless attack by man or nation. I have read five or six letters by Mr. Dole to me or about me on this whole matter, and I can never come, in the end, to any other conclusion than that this criticism is that I would use force to protect a man from a criminal man or a criminal nation. This is the point of the letter in UNITY. Mr. Dole is complaining because I justify a nation opposing a really burglarizing nation by force. It is true that I do, just as I justify an individual in using force to expel a burglar from his house or prevent him murdering his children. I cannot see that the former has anything to do with wars, any more than the latter has to do with duelling. This is a needless analogy, however, for I imagine that Mr. Dole would oppose the use of force to prevent the burglar from entering a house or killing the children. If he does not, how then can he oppose the use of it to prevent the big nation plundering the little, or Turkey massacring the Armenians? I called attention in an article in another paper in answer to a letter of Mr. Dole, to the fact that neither Belgium nor France ever looked upon the late conflict as a war. They were perfectly right. It was not a war. Germany simply rushed into Belgium and France without any warning. Belgium and France resisted. I think they had no other course. Mr. Dole thinks they did wrong to resist: they should have let Germany take the two nations, do what she pleased with them, and then proceed to take England, which she herself confesses she would have done and probably could have done. All this has no more to do with war than keeping a burglar out of the house has to do with duelling. It is simply a question of whether a criminal man or a criminal nation should be hindered by force or not from carrying out his evil intentions. I think force is justified under these conditions; Mr. Dole evidently thinks it is not. I cannot, as yet, get Mr. Dole to say just what he would do in the case of the burglarizing man or nation.

The exact form of the letter in UNITY is misleading. It was called forth by an article I wrote as an appeal to my French friends at the time France was opposing at the Washington Conference the elimination of submarines. I led up to my appeal to the French people by a few words showing that we Americans understood the French. Mr. Dole picks upon one or two sentences from these paragraphs. They are simply statements of facts and have nothing to do with my sentiments. As a matter of fact, regardless of how much we may feel that there were contributing causes to the war in all nations, as I do feel, Germany did burglarize Belgium and France without any warning. Of course the French know this and everybody does. Some of the best Germans, especially those close to the inception of the war, admit it. (Lichnowsky and just recently Scheideman are illustrious examples.) Those of us who were in Germany on August second knew that England was begging Mr. Grey to pause and consider, and arbitrate, and everybody knew both that she did not and did not want to. It is a closed question among all who want to face the facts. All I say is that France *naturally* thinks in terms of fear. Again it is perfectly natural that the French cannot trust the German word after what has happened. Mr. Dole criticizes me for not trying to disabuse the French mind of this fear and mistrust. Dear Mr. Dole, that is just what I have been doing for three years, and I think if you will read the closing paragraphs of the very article you criticize you will see that it was the thing I am attempting even there. But I began it at the Hague in 1919. I said publicly at that year's conference of the World Alliance that we all of us, Frenchmen included, must trust the new Germany if there was going to be any peace or brotherhood in Europe. At Beatenberg I came back to the same point. Last year I wrote a long pamphlet on this very question which has been debated for a year in both the German and French religious press. I spoke as plainly to the French as Mr. Dole himself might desire—not about their past conduct, but about their present and future. I was severely censured by my French friends—until they understood. I was attempting in this last article to persuade them once more to put their trust in spiritual forces and venture a little more in the world of faith than they seemed inclined to do. "Never," I said, "has the whole world expected so much from any gathering as from this Conference at Washington. Mr. Hughes raised those hopes even higher. In one of the great New York dailies there is an editorial to-day on this very point. The editorial is really bitter against France for dashing these high hopes. I am writing all this because I am a friend of France and I am hoping that in spite of all the naturalness and reasonableness perhaps of the French position, yet that a few prophetic and liberal voices may be able to persuade the French people to act a little more on faith and risk what perhaps to them is a big emprize. For after all there is a protection for France which is infinitely stronger, more certain and enduring than any armies or navies she can build, and that is a warless world. Every such conference as this at Washington is making for that. The further the Conference goes, the nearer comes the warless world. It would be almost morally impossible for any nation, even Germany, to go on piling up armament, in the face of a general agreement of the rest of the world to disarm. Other conferences will follow—and Germany will be there. Perhaps the best protection France can make for herself is to throw her energy into building up in Europe that new world order toward which the Conference is looking, rather than to building submarines. Furthermore we are absolutely sure that even were there danger of German invasion ten or twenty years hence—and there could not be if the nations would go right on toward a new world order as fast as they are going at this moment—the moral indignation of the United States against a nation that would attack a nation which signed a

compact at Washington with three other nations, ours among them, would be so great, that it would rush to annihilate the attacking nation without a moment's pause. The signing of a treaty by France with the three other nations to disarm to the furthest point that has been proposed, is a pledge on the part of the three nations to rush to her aid if wantonly attacked that is as strong as any guarantee these nations could make to her."

The one phrase which Mr. Dole attacks, an incidental word, used when I was trying to show the French people that they were perfectly safe in abolishing their submarines, or even doing without special alliance with Great Britain and the United States, if they signed the four power treaty, is an unfortunate and hurried expression and deserves censure. I said that in the new temper of the world happily engendered by the Washington Conference, that if the French people practiced an act of faith and disarmed, trusting to the new spirit and signing the treaty in that confidence, that if an outside nation took advantage of that act of faith, and burglarized her that the indignation of the United States would be such that we would "rush to annihilate the attacking nation without a moment's pause." I should have used the word "army," instead of nation. I sincerely believe that every decent nation would rush to annihilate the army that attacked the nation that in a Christian act of renunciation totally disarmed, and what is more I should *hope* so: just as I should hope that a man seeing a burglar trying to kill the defenseless household of an honored citizen, would rush in with all speed to help destroy the burglar. FREDERICK LYNCH.

The Internationalism of Lincoln

February 25, 1922.

To the Editor of UNITY:

The editorial in the issue of UNITY, February 16, telling of the Bolshevik button affixed on a picture of Lincoln to the lapel of his coat was of exceeding interest to me. I have not the slightest doubt that that was done in a spirit of reverence and as an expression of the highest honor that the donor could pay to the memory of one whose name must be forever associated with the idea of freedom—for so many weary years an ideal so passionately striven for by the starved and eager souls of that stricken Russian people.

The quotation given from Lincoln's address may well have been the one that inspired the tribute, yet perhaps there had come to the notice of Sartov one other that is to be found in a letter from Lincoln to the Workingmen's Committee of New York City—dated March 21, 1864,—a sentence which breathes that true and exalted spirit of internationalism which all peoples today should endeavor to attain. The quotation I refer to is the following: "The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside the family relation, should be one uniting all working-people, of all nations and tongues and kindreds."

Brookline, Mass. LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

Drums and battle cries
Go out in music of the morning-star—
And soon we shall have thinkers in the place
Of fighters, each found able as a man
To strike electric influence through a race,
Unstayed by city wall and barican.

—*Elizabeth Barrett Browning.*

The Boycott

To the Editor:

A theory of life or method of progress which entails immeasurable suffering in its consummation raises questions at once in minds of those not yet converted to its validity. Even its advocates should hesitate and should question the wisdom of such a method. This is especially true when the program involves many innocent persons and especially when its execution must fall first upon the weak and helpless. Non-resistance is a beautiful ideal. But when this takes the form of a boycott then it becomes a terrible weapon of offense against all, guilty and innocent alike, who stand in its path. No one can question the beauty and nobility of Gandhi, the Indian saint. But when he institutes a boycott against English cotton goods and seeks to destroy in a day an intricate commercial system built up in the course of a century his first victims are not the responsible government officials in India or in Great Britain. They are not even the owners of the great mills of Lancashire and Yorkshire. These may be able to weather the storm. The first victims of such a policy (which will be terrible if carried out with thoroughness), will be the helpless dependents of the workers in the cotton mills. It will be a veritable slaughter of innocents. It means for thousand of children and aged persons sickness, starvation and death. The strong will escape. The weak will go down before the merciless weapon of "non-intercourse," in the form of a boycott.

Cruel as has been the policy of the Government in India; wicked as was the massacre at Amritsar and vicious as is the commercial exploitation of India, can anyone believe that the way out is to first attack those who are in no wise to blame for the situation. This, whatever it is, is not a gospel of love but policy of blind hate. It is the repetition of the mistake of the ages. Love requires co-operation. Intercourse not non-intercourse is the way of life. Love depends on the weapons of the spirit. It stakes its all on the power of goodwill to lift even enemies to a common level of thought. If Gandhi fails in India he will fail not because of the weakness of his cause but rather because he has forsaken the sword of the spirit and taken the sword of material power.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

PETITION.

PRAY GOD LET ME BE MAN WITHOUT A COUNTRY!

I who preach humanity—let me not serve
Thwarted by foolish lines set up to be
The boundaries of Faith that knows no end—
Curbstones of infidelity and sacrilege
Upon whose soulless shameless altar-place
Men slay each other in a wild debauch
Of imbecilic orgy! Let me not be
Misguided by that child of bastardy
Which men have faultily conceived to be
The patriot's part! Forbid forever, Lord,
Even the sacrificial tragedy's
Inoculation of the toxic wine
By which man's reason totters on its throne
Till he lose sight of life in its entirety
And be divested of the heritage
Of calm serenely sane intelligence
Which is thy crowning glory in the world.

HARRIET LAKE-BURCH.

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

NEUTRAL COMMISSION

Of Investigation into the Causes, Conduct and Conclusion of the War.

Chairman—Dr. A. C. Drolsum, Chief Librarian of the University of Christiania.

Treasurer—Archbishop Jens Tandberg, Primate of the National Church of Norway.

Secretary—Dr. E. Manger, Amsterdam.

Commissioners

Holland—Dr. N. Japikse, Director of the Dutch Board of Historical Publications. Dr. S. R. Steinmetz, Professor of Ethnology, University of Amsterdam.

Norway—Dr. Hjalmar Christensen, Civil Governor. Dr. A. C. Drolsum, Chief Librarian of the University of Christiania.

Sweden—Dr. Helge Almquist, Professor of History, University of Gothenburg. Dr. A. C. Reuterskioeld, Professor of International Law, University of Upsala.

Argentine, Chile, Spain, Switzerland—Committees from these Countries are being formed.

A movement of the highest importance and value has just been set on foot in Europe, in the organization and constitution of a Neutral Commission of Investigation into the Causes, Conduct and Conclusion of the War.

More than a year ago there was developed a sentiment, among a number of the leading citizens, publicists, jurists, scholars and men of letters of Norway, Sweden, Holland and Switzerland, which found expression in the following declaration:

"We, the undersigned, citizens of countries which did not participate in the World War, desire to express the wish that the responsibility for the war should be examined under conditions which would accord with the principles of scientific research and objective justice, so that the facts and conclusions shall be unassailable.

"We are of opinion that such an examination is possible only through an unpartisan Commission of competent citizens of neutral countries."

This declaration was eargerly subscribed to, not only by eminent men and women of the neutral countries, but by some of the most distinguished and influential citizens of England and France.

Among these are: Professor Sir Gilbert Murray, Lord Parmoor, Lady Courtney, General C. B. Thomson, Arthur Ponsonby, Charles Trevelyan, E. D. Morel, Ramsay Macdonald, Bertrand Russell, Henri Barbusse, Georges de Martial, Romain Rolland, Marquis de Villeneuve (brother-in-law of Prince Bonaparte), Madame de Sairy-Priz (daughter of Ex-president Loubet), Savornin Lohmann, Prof. Albert Einstein, Knut Hamsun, Selma Lagerloef, Prof. Oscar Montelius and Maxim Gorky.

These men and women realized that the true history of this lamentable conflict had not yet been told, and that it was most urgent that it should be told soon. They believed that the truth of it, when known, would conduce to those mutual good understandings between nations which are essential to the world's peace and prosperity.

The idea was enthusiastically taken up in Norway, Sweden and Holland. Meetings were held and electoral committees were appointed for choosing representatives to constitute the Neutral Commission.

The Commission as now constituted is an absolutely free, unfettered and uninfluenced body. Its members were elected for no other purpose than to sit and decide as an unprejudiced, impartial tribunal. The questions with which the Commission will concern itself, chiefly, are the following:

1. Who was responsible for the outbreak of the war at the end of July, 1914?
2. Who was responsible for the extension of the war from a local conflict to a war of the world?
3. Who was responsible for the duration of the war through so many years, and its ending in a peace of violence rather than in a peace of reconciliation?
4. Who was responsible for the fact that the war was conducted contrary to the principles of international law?
5. Who was responsible for the fact that the war violated the rights of neutrals?

This movement, entirely spontaneous and unofficial, promises to be of historic importance. Composed, as the Commission is, of men of wide experience in international affairs, accustomed to make impartial judgments, its investigations and conclusions are certain to influence the statesmen and ministers who are seriously engaged in finding the right solution to the problems which are now confronting the world.

The sufferings that are being experienced by the peoples of Europe, owing to the economic chaos prevailing there, are, perhaps, greater now than they were during the war. They are due, largely, to an attitude of antagonism on the part of these peoples towards each other—an antagonism that was born of misrepresentation and is being nursed in ignorance. Those who are in sympathy with this movement now on foot, are inspired by the hope that the Commission's findings will help to enlighten these peoples as to the real facts, and thus bring about a change of attitude, so that justice may be done on the basis of truth, and the intercourse between nations be resumed for mutual well-being.

So worthy an enterprise could not pass unnoticed in America, the citizens of which country must be profoundly concerned in establishing amicable relations between the nations of Europe, and between them and their own country. The world's needs urgently demand this.

The American Committee has, therefore, been organized to support the Neutral Commission. The members and associates of this Committee have been greatly encouraged by the prospect of the Commission's activities, and they have taken a pride in pledging themselves to further them in so far as it lies in their power, to the end that the Commission shall neither be hampered in its deliberations nor delayed in its findings.

The American Committee believes that a Neutral Commission of this character will appeal strongly to all high-minded citizens of this country, who have never failed to respond to any call in the cause of justice and truth. It is recognized that the authority of this Commission would be much strengthened and the consummation of its purposes assured, if it were supported by the association and financial assistance of influential citizens of America.

It has been planned to raise an adequate Fund to help this Commission to accomplish its purposes, and for this Fund the sum of $50,000 is practically assured.

The opportunity is herewith presented to others to help. They are asked to become associated with an enterprise the results of which must, of a certainty, dissipate the evil prejudices of the war, and thus leave us free to offer a saner consideration and a wiser settlement to the world's pressing problems than are now possible. The day is not far distant, when those who have supported this undertaking, will experience a very profound satisfaction in having taken part in an historic movement of world-wide benefit.

American Committee Neutral Commission of Investigation Into the Causes, Conduct and Conclusion of the War.
Temple Scott, Secretary,
167 W. 72nd St., New York.

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Subscribe for and read UNITY!

Ready March 18

A New Book by
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
entitled

NEW CHURCHES FOR OLD

This book presents a thoroughgoing study of the religious situation in America today, with special reference to the community church movement as the constructive force which is opening up a New Reformation. Most of its material is new, and all has been prepared especially for this work. It answers the questions you want answered about our church.

Published by
Dodd, Mead & Co., - New York
$2.00

The Negro and the White

A Study in Race Relations

Is there a growing hostility between the Negro and White races in the United States? Some careful observers think so. Do the teachings of Jesus furnish principles on which friendship between them could be firmly based?

THE WORLD TOMORROW for March will take up these questions. Articles on the contribution of the Negro to American life; the economic cause of Negro subjugation; the poison of race prejudice; the question of racial inferiority, intermarriage, social equality, etc. Reading list and topics for group discussion.

Each month THE WORLD TOMORROW discusses some single subject of outstanding importance.

Subscribe Now ***One Dollar a Year***

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

THE ECONOMIC FOUNDATIONS OF THE CHURCH
By George Willis Cooke
Write for pamphlet to the
Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago
Reprinted from Unity
Price 10 cents. Ten copies, 50 cents

It's a "Case" of Necessity
Your Printing will be above criticism if done by
THE OAKLAND PRESS
728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 0231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

Main Office and Work:
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO